Soon thereafter, two panels were convened by the Secretary of State to review the bombings. The two commissions were chaired by retired Admiral William Crowe, the former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and former Ambassador to the United Kingdom. The Crowe commissions recommended that the U.S. government devote \$1.4 billion per year for each of the next ten years to security.

Unfortunately, the legislation before the Senate falls far short of what the Crowe commissions recommended. The bill appropriates just \$300 million for security in the State Department operations accounts, and just \$110 million for security in the capital account. But of this latter amount, only \$36 million is provided for construction or renovation of new embassies-\$264 million below the President's request. Moreover, the bill rescinds \$58 million in previously-appropriated funds in this same account. Neither the bill nor the Committee report explains how these funds will be restored to meet continuing and future needs.

Finally, the bill denies the Administration's request for \$3.6 billion in advance funding for capital projects for Fiscal Years 2001 to 2005. The Department based this request on bitter experience. In the mid-1980s, after a commission chaired by Admiral Bobby Inman recommended massive increases in embassy security, Congress initially responded by providing significant funding and significant promises. But as the years passed, security became a second-order priority; the requested funding for security was denied by Congress, and some of the money that had been allocated for security was either rescinded by Congress or redirected to other priorities. By the mid-1990s, the Inman Commission report was collecting dust on government bookshelves, its recommendations barely recalled, and funding for security had been reduced considerably.

So, understandably, the State Department is skeptical that the grand promises made in the wake of the embassy bombings will be fulfilled. With considerable justification, the State Department experts have told Congress that it can best move forward on a sensible and rational construction program if it can be assured in advance of the necessary funds. Otherwise, the Department of State rightly fears, we will see a repeat of the experience after the Inman Commission.

The Committee on Foreign Relations, and then the full Senate, responded to this plea by providing a \$3 billion authorization over five years in S. 886, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act. But that was just the first step. The authorization will be useless without appropriations. Unfortunately, the Committee on Appropriations has ignored the State Department's request in this bill.

I believe this bill breaks faith with the bold promises that were made in the wake of the embassy bombings last summer. We need to do much, much more to protect our dedicated public servants working overseas. I strongly urge the chairman and ranking member to look for additional resources to fund this important account, without compromising the other important foreign affairs accounts.

THE HATE CRIMES PREVENTION ACT OF 1999

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, one of the most significant amendments adopted by the Senate in consideration of the Commerce, Justice, State and the Judiciary Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2000 is the Hate Crimes Prevention Act. I commend Senator KENNEDY for his leadership in this effort and on this bill, and I am proud to have been an original cosponsor. This legislation amends the federal hate crimes statute to make it easier for federal law enforcement officials to investigate and prosecute cases of racial and religious violence. It also focuses the attention and resources of the federal government on the problem of hate crimes committed against people because of their sexual preference, gender, or disability.

Violent crime motivated by prejudice demands attention from all of us. It is not a new problem, but recent incidents of hate crimes have shocked the American conscience. Just this month, an adherent of a white supremacist group killed two people and wounded nine others in a shooting rampage in Illinois and Indiana that was apparently motivated by racial and religious hate. Billy Jack Gaither. 39, was beaten to death in Alabama because he was gay. Matthew Sheppard, 21, was left to die on a fence in Wyoming because he was gay. James Byrd, Jr., 49, a father of three, was dragged to his death behind a pickup truck in Texas because he was black. These are sensational crimes, the ones that focus public attention. But there also is a toll we are paying each year in other hate crimes that find less notoriety, but with no less suffering for the victims and their families.

It remains painfully clear that we as a nation still have serious work to do in protecting all Americans from these crimes and in ensuring equal rights for all our citizens. The answer to hate and bigotry must ultimately be found in increased respect and tolerance. But strengthening our federal hate crimes legislation is a step in the right direction. Bigotry and hatred are corrosive elements in any society, but especially in a country as diverse and open as ours. We need to make clear that a bigoted attack on one or some of us diminishes each of us, and it diminishes our nation. As a nation, we must say

I believe this bill breaks faith with loudly and clearly that we will defend be bold promises that were made in ourselves against such violence.

All Americans have the right to live, travel and gather where they choose. In the past we have responded as a nation to deter and to punish violent denials of civil rights. We have enacted federal laws to protect the civil rights of all of our citizens for more than 100 years. This continues that great and honorable tradition.

Several of us come to this issue with backgrounds in local law enforcement. We support local law enforcement and work for initiatives that assist law enforcement. It is in this vein as well that I support the Hate Crimes Prevention Act, which has received strong bipartisan support from state and local law enforcement organizations across the country.

The bill has been materially improved since its introduction on March 16th. At that time, I questioned whether the bill was sufficiently respectful of state and local law enforcement interests and cautioned against federalizing prohibitions that may already exist at the state and local level. The Senatepassed bill includes a new certification requirement, which provides that the Federal government may only step in where the State has not assumed jurisdiction, the State has requested that the federal government assume jurisdiction, or the State's actions are likely to leave unvindicated the Federal interest in eradicating bias-motivated violence. I am satisfied that this provision will ensure that the Hate Crimes Prevention Act operates as intended, strengthening Federal jurisdiction over hate crimes as a back-up, but not a substitute, for state and local law enforcement.

The Hate Crimes Prevention Act gives us a formidable tool for combating acts of violence motivated by race, color, national origin, religion, sexual orientation, gender, or disability. I urge its speedy passage into law

SENATE QUARTERLY MAIL COSTS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, in accordance with section 318 of Public Law 101-520 as amended by Public Law 103–283, I am submitting the frank mail allocations made to each Senator from the appropriations for official mail expenses and a summary tabulation of Senate mass mail costs for the first and second quarter of FY99 to be printed in the RECORD. The first and second quarters of FY99 cover the periods of October 1, 1998, through December 31, 1998, and January 1, 1999 through March 31, 1999. The official mail allocations are available for franked mail costs, as stipulated in Public Law 105-275, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act of 1999.

I ask unanimous consent that the frank mail allocations and summary tabulation be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senators	FY 99 Official mail allocation	Senate quarterly mass mail volumes and costs for the quarter ending December 12, 1998				Senate quarterly mass mail volumes and costs for the quarter ending March 31, 1999			
		Total pieces	Pieces per capita	Total cost	Cost per capita	Total pieces	Pieces per capita	Total cost	Cost per capita
AbrahamAkaka	\$111,746 34,648	0	0	\$0.00 0.00	0	0	0	\$0.00 0.00	(
Allard	63,266 77,190	0	0	0.00 0.00	0	0	0	0.00 0.00	(
Baucus	33,847	0	0	0.00	0	23,970	0.0300	21,348.57	0.02672
Bayh	60,223 40,959	0	0	0.00 0.00	0	0	0	0.00	(
Biden Bingaman	31,559 41,646	0	0	0.00 0.00	0	0	0	0.00 0.00	(
Bond	77,190	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	Ì
BoxerBreaux	301,322 66,514	0	0	0.00 0.00	0	0	0	0.00 0.00	(
Brownback Bryan	49,687 41,258	0	0	0.00 0.00	0	0	0	0.00 0.00	(
Bumpers	13,218	Ö	Ö	0.00	Ö	Ö	Ö	0.00	Ì
Bunning	46,853 33,857	0	0	0.00 0.00	0	0 4,295	0.00538	0.00 3,399.30	0.00425
Byrd	43,560 63,266	0	0	0.00 0.00	0	0	0	0.00 0.00	(
Chafee	34,307	Ö	Ö	0.00	Ö	Ö	Ö	0.00	Ì
Coats	95,484 21,139	0	0	0.00 0.00	0	0	0	0.00 0.00	(
Cochran Collins	50,337 37,775	0	0	0.00 0.00	0	0	0	0.00 0.00	(
Conrad	31,000	198,640	0.31096	30,318.17	0.04746	37,870	0.05928	6,075.13	0.0095
Coverdell	95,484 35,841	0	0	0.00 0.00	0	0 3,000	0.0298	0.00 568.71	0.00056
Crapo	27,070 183,036	0	0	0.00 0.00	0	0	0	0.00 0.00	(
D'Amato Daschle	31,638	_ 0	0	0.00	0	. 0	0	0.00	(
DeWine	132,302 56,116	5,182 0	0.00048	4,549.16 0.00	0.00042	3,130 0	0.00029	2,072.47 0.00	0.00019
Domenici	41,646	0	Ö	0.00	Ö	0	0	0.00	Ì
Dorgan	31,000 128,275	0	0	0.00 0.00	0	0	0	0.00 0.00	(
Edwards	76,489 29.891	0	0	0.00 0.00	0	0	0	0.00 0.00	(
Faircloth	29,275	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	Ì
Feingold	72,089 301,322	0	0	0.00 0.00	0	0	0	0.00 0.00	(
Fitzgerald	97,925 16,353	0	0	0.00 0.00	0	0	0	0.00 0.00	(
Frist	76,208	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	(
GlennGorton	35,757 78,087	0 1,410	0.00029	0.00 192.02	0.00004	0	0	0.00 0.00	(
Graham	182,107	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00015	0.00	0.0000
GrammGrams	204,461 67,542	5,800	0.00133	0.00 1,169.33	0.00027	2,551 23,558	0.00015 0.00538	902.37 10,939.04	0.00005 0.00250
Grassley	52,115 35.947	0	0	0.00 0.00	0	0	0	0.00	(
Hagel	40,350	0	Ö	0.00	Ö	133,000	0.0846	24,409.19	0.0154
Harkin	52,115 40,959	0	0	0.00 0.00	0	0	0	0.00 0.00	(
Helms	100,311 61,281	0	0	0.00 0.00	0	0	0	0.00 0.00	(
Hutchinson	50,285	Ö	Ö	0.00	Ö	Ö	Ö	0.00	Ì
Hutchison	204,461 58,788	0	0	0.00 0.00	0	0	0	0.00 0.00	(
Inouye	34,648 30,740	0	0	0.00 0.00	0	0 18,439	0.03277	0.00 7,600.92	0.01351
Johnson	31,638	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.03277	0.00	0.0133
Kennedy	9,246 82,469	3.000	0.00050	0.00 1,036.89	0.00017	5,678	0.00094	0.00 2.019.95	0.00034
Kerrey	40,350 82,469	0	0	0.00 0.00	0	0	0	0.00 0.00	(
Kerry	72,089	0	Ŏ	0.00	Õ	Õ	0	0.00	(
Kyl Landrieu	68,434 66,514	78,000	0.01848	0.00 13,801,20	0.00327	0	0	0.00 0.00	(
Lautenberg	97,304 30,740	0 1,128	0.00200	0.00 901.17	0.00160	0 3,123	0.00555	0.00	0.00444
Leahy Levin	111,476	0	0.00200	0.00	0.00160	2,000	0.00333	2,499.77 403.63	0.00004
Lieberman	56,116 38,142	0	0	0.00 0.00	0	0	0	0.00 0.00	(
Lott	50,337	Ö	Ö	0.00	Ö	Ö	Ö	0.00	Ì
Lugar	79,091 182,107	0	0	0.00 0.00	0	0	0	0.00 0.00	(
McCain	68,434 61,650	0	0	0.00 0.00	0	0	0	0.00 0.00	(
McConnell Mikulski	71,555	0	Ŏ	0.00	Õ	ŏ	0	0.00	(
Moseley-Braun	128,275 183,036	0	0	0.00 0.00	0	0	0	0.00 0.00	(
Murkowski	30,905	0	0	0.00	0	1 200	0.00027	0.00	0.0000
Murray	78,087 58,788	0	0	0.00 0.00	0	1,300 702	0.00027 0.00022	433.14 564.90	0.00009 0.00018
Reed	34,307 41,258	0	0	0.00 0.00	0	0	0	0.00 0.00	(
Robb	87,385	Ŏ	0	0.00	Õ	Ò	Õ	0.00	(
Roberts	49,687 43,560	0	0	0.00 0.00	0	0	0	0.00 0.00	(
Roth	31,559 138,265	0	0	0.00 0.00	0	0	0	0.00 0.00	(
SantorumSarbanes	71,555	0	0	0.00	0	9,300	0.00195	2,039.43	0.00043
Schumer	139,902 67,265	0	0	0.00 0.00	0	0	0	0.00 0.00	(
Shelby	67,265	0	0	0.00	Ŏ	0	0	0.00	Ì
Smith, GordonSmith, Robert	56,383 35,947	0	0	0.00 0.00	0	0	0	0.00 0.00	(
Snowe	37,755 138,265	0	0	0.00 0.00	0	0	0	0.00 0.00	(
Stevens	30,905	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	,

Senators	FY 99 Official mail allocation	Senate quarterly mass mail volumes and costs for the quarter ending December 12, 1998				Senate quarterly mass mail volumes and costs for the quarter ending March 31, 1999			
		Total pieces	Pieces per capita	Total cost	Cost per capita	Total pieces	Pieces per capita	Total cost	Cost per capita
Thomas	29.891	4.052	0.00893	3.488.32	0.00769	0	0	0.00	
Thompson	76.208	4,032	0.00033	0.00	0.00703	Ů	Ů	0.00	0
Thurmond	61,281	ň	ň	0.00	ň	ň	ň	0.00	ň
Torricelli	97.304	7.585	0.00098	6.746.15	0.00087	8.410	0.00109	7.622.56	0.00098
Voinovich	101,012	7,000	0.00030	0.00	0.00007	0,410	0.00103	0.00	0.00030
Warner	87.385	ŏ	ő	0.00	ŏ	ŏ	ŏ	0.00	ŏ
Wellstone	67.42	ŏ	ő	0.00	ŏ	ŏ	ŏ	0.00	ŏ
Wyden	56,383	Ŏ	Ŏ	0.00	ő	915	0.00032	723,80	0.00025
Total		304,797	0.34394	62,202.41	0.06179	281,241	0.23104	93.622.88	0.07952

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I rise today to thank Chairman GREGG and Senator HOLLINGS for accepting an amendment I offered to the FY2000 Commerce, Justice, State Appropriations bill that will provide \$500,000 for a truck safety program in New Jersey. This critical initiative will allow the State Police to finally purchase much needed portable scales and accompanying computer equipment that will enable them to better monitor and control large trucks that utilize local roads.

This amendment was necessary because more than 5,300 people, including 660 children, died in highway crashes with big trucks last year, and the number of carriers on local roads throughout the nation continues to rise. This problem has become particularly acute in New Jersey. For example, Route 31 in the northwest part of the state previously accommodated several hundreds trucks a day. That number has now grown to well over 3,000 trucks a day, and four people have died in truck related accidents on this road in the past 24 months.

In order to increase safety through improved enforcement efforts, I introduced this amendment to provide the New Jersey State Police with the modern equipment necessary to effectively regulate these oversized vehicles. This additional funding will be used to purchase almost 120 new mobile truck scales and 60 mobile data computers. The current scales, which often break down and require heavy, outdated batteries, will be replaced with lighter scales that are maintenance free. The new computers, which can be mounted in trooper's vehicles, would allow the police direct access to the Commercial Vehicle Information Safety Network and enable them to perform immediate checks on truckers who are violating the law.

This new equipment will go a long way towards keeping these oversized carriers off of smaller, undivided local roads and will send a strong message that we remain committed to protecting our communities. Again, I am grateful to Senators Greeg and Hollings for their support.

MAYOR'S PETITION ON THE NO_X SIP CALL

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, last year, EPA finalized the NO_X SIP call,

forcing 22 states to submit plans to meet mandated reductions of nitrogen oxide (NO_X) emissions. Our nation's mayors are concerned that the SIP call will have adverse effects on brownfields redevelopment and economic growth.

Earlier this year, the National Conference of Black Mayors and the U.S. Conference of Mayors held their annual conferences. Over 100 mayors from around the country signed a petition calling on the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to provide utility energy providers with maximum flexibility and the leadtime necessary to avoid higher energy costs to municipalities and local communities, including industrial and residential consumers.

The mayors are asking U.S. EPA to reconsider how the deadlines set in the NO_X SIP call could affect electricity reliability in urban and rural areas. In essence our mayor's are saying that any new programs to control NO_X emission must be weighed against potential economic adverse implications.

Mr. President, the U.S. Court of Appeals issued a stay of EPA's NO_X SIP call pending a decision on the lawsuit brought by states. Nonetheless, the Mayors' petition represents a commonsense plea to EPA that, should the agency move forward to implement NO_X reductions, that it do so in a way that allows for compliance in a cost-effective manner that does not adversely impact economic growth or significantly increase utility prices to consumers.

I ask unanimous consent that the petition be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PETITION

EPA OZONE TRANSPORT NO_X SIP CALL

As part of its Ozone Transport initiative, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has finalized a rulemaking forcing States to submit Implementation Plans (SIPs) to meet mandated reductions of oxides of nitrogen (NO_X) emissions in the Agency's effort to control inter-state ozone transport impacts. The rule focuses on 22 mid-eastern States, with the likelihood that EPA will expand the application of the rule to several additional States

Several States have joined in litigation challenging the EPA rule on grounds that it is contrary to congressional intent, an abuse of Agency discretion and disregards traditional Federal/State relationships. EPA has even taken the unprecedented step of threat-

ening to impose its own Federal Implementation Plan (FIP) in the absence of acceptable State action. Several additional States are considering whether to file an amicus brief in support of the Complaint. The U.S. Court of Appeals recently stayed EPA's $\rm NO_X$ SIP Call pending appeal of the Court's decision setting aside EPA's new Ozone and Particulate Matter standards.

One element of the rule would force local utilities to control $\mathrm{NO_X}$ emissions at levels unprecedented to date. The reductions are of a magnitude that will require capital intensive technology with likely significant pass-through costs to energy consumers. The unavoidable consequence will be higher energy costs to municipalities and local communities, including industrial and residential consumers alike. As rural and urban communities seek investment to spur economic growth, the shadow of higher energy costs could have significant adverse effects on Brownfields redevelopment and rural/urban revitalization generally.

The EPA compliance deadline are so stringent that electric utilities could be forced to shut down generating plants to install the necessary control equipment within a very short time. This could result in a temporary disruption of electricity supply.

Significant NO_X emissions reductions will continue to be realized under existing mobile and stationary control programs as the Clean Air Act continues to be implemented thus minimizing the need, if any, for such potentially disruptive requirements as called for in the EPA NO_X rule. This is especially true for local areas in the mid-east that are dealing effectively with ozone compliance challenges. Any new control programs, before being implemented, must be weighed against the potential adverse implications for local rural and urban communities.

Accordingly, by our signatures below, we collectively call on EPA to reconsider the NO_X rule in light of these concerns. In light of the Court's stay of the NO_X SIP Call, at a minimum, we urge EPA to provide maximum flexibility to and address lead-time needs of utility energy providers so as to minimize potential adverse economic consequences to local rural and urban communities. Further, we call on EPA to restore balance and cooperation between states and EPA so that States can comply with the rule while protecting their rights to determine the best methods of doing so.

Finally, we direct that copies of this Petition be provided to the President, the Vice President, Members of Congress, Governors and other local officials as are appropriate.

Alabama: Moses, Walter S. Hill.

Arkansas: North Little Rock, Patrick H. Hayes; Marianna, Robert Taylor; Sunset, James Wilburn.

California: Alameda, Ralph J. Appezzato; Fairfield, George Pettygrove; Fresno, Jim Patterson; Inglewood, Rosevelt F. Dorn; Modesto, Richard A. Lang; Turlock, Dr. Curt Andre; Westminster, Frank G. Fry.